



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,482	09/22/2003	Hiromichi Yoshikawa	D-1524	5526
32628	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
			DUNN, DAVID R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3616	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/665,482	YOSHIKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David Dunn	3616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 7-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/22/03, 3/29/04, 2/4/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Priority*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

*Information Disclosure Statement*

2. The information disclosure statements filed 9/22/03, 3/29/04, and 4/08/04 are acknowledged. See enclosed IDS forms.

*Election/Restrictions*

3. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I and Species A in the reply filed on August 5, 2005 is acknowledged.
4. Claims 4 and 7-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species and/or invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on August 5, 2005.

It is noted that Applicant stated that claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are readable on the elected species; however claim 5 is dependent from claim 2. It appears that claim 2 can be interpreted to read on the Species A as shown in Figure 2(a), for example (the second portion 14B is inflated upwardly along the leg). Therefore, claim 2 has also been included for examination on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said second portion". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites that the "first portion is integrated with the second portion"; this is indefinite as it is unclear how the first portion is "integrated" with the second. It appears that the two portions are part of the same airbag, but it does not appear that the first portion is integrated with the second. The specification only use the word "integrated" only on page 30 with respect to Figure 19; the specification does not describe the two portions being "integrated".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (6,217,059).

Airbag 110 is in front of the ankle; see Figure 5.

9. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertrand (2,834,606).

See Figure 2; lower airbags 33 are in front of the ankle.

10. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saslecov (6,092,836).

See Figure 2; a first portion of the airbag is in front of the ankle (at location of pointer 12; “in front of”, i.e., forward of); a second portion is in front of the knee (at location of pointer 9).

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saslecov in view of Takimoto et al. (6,752,417).

Saslecov is discussed above but does not show the portions with a duct portion.

Takimoto et al. teaches a similar airbag with a duct portion communicating between two portions (see, for example, Figure 10, between “33”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saslecov with the teachings to provide a duct between the upper and lower portions in order to better control the inflation of the airbag.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hass shows a knee bag of interest. Cumming et al. shows an airbag of interest. Abe shows a leg protection airbag. Kitagawa shows an airbag in front of the ankle.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Dunn whose telephone number is 571-272-6670. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on 571-272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Dunn  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3616